

NOTES.

FURTHER NOTE ON THE TYPE-SPECIMEN OF *Voluta Roadnightiæ*, McCoy. (Read 8th Nov. 1901.)—With reference to the communication read at the Malacological Society's meeting in November (Proc. Malac. Soc., vol. iv, p. 184), I cannot consider the matter of the type-specimen settled, unless the specimen stated to be the type in the National Museum (Melb.) corresponds in every particular to the numerous and very precise measurements given by the late Professor Sir Frederick McCoy (Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. v, vol. viii, 1881, p. 88). The illustration in this work does not seem to correspond with that in the "Thesaurus Conchyliorum." Sowerby's figure is that of a perfect shell, McCoy's shows the anterior extremity with a ragged or broken edge, while the 18 or 19 spiral striæ encircling the upper portion of the body-whorl from the outer to the inner lip are not shown by Sowerby, and the arrangement of the ribs differs in the two figures. Sowerby says, "*Columella tenuiter triplicata*," and only three small plaits are visible in his figure; whereas McCoy states, "three or four large oblique plaits on pillar, the hindmost but one the largest": this and other differences ought to be a sure means of identification. Unfortunately all who could have vouched for the authenticity of the type-specimen have passed away. In conclusion I should like to point out that, although in McCoy's description of the type-specimen it is noted as having been found in 1878, no specimen was exhibited until the specimen found at Portland (which was generally supposed to be the type) was purchased in 1881; it will be observed that Sir Frederick, although he says he had described the type three years previously to the publication of the description in 1881, does not mention its being in the possession of the Museum, and if it was, it seems rather singular that it was not made use of for the wax model for the Trustees of the Australian Museum, Sydney.

Unfortunately, owing to the removal of the conchological specimens from the University Museum to the Technological Museum, where they still remain packed up, the specimens cannot be compared.

(MRS.) A. KENYON.

NOTE ON *EULOTA BLAKEANA*, NEWC., AND *EULOTA LUNA*, PILS. (Read 13th Dec. 1901.)—Some misapprehension, which it is desirable to rectify, concerning the correct synonymy of *Eulota Blakeana* having got abroad, the following note, it is hoped, will remove any doubt that may exist as to the identity of the above two species.

In my first report on Helicoid Land-Shells from Japan and the Loo-Choo Islands (Proc. Malac. Soc., vol. iv, p. 16) I referred some shells which I there figured, to *Eulota Blakeana*, Newc. Dr. Pilsbry afterwards pointed out to me that my shells were distinct from Newcomb's species, but agreed